STATE HISTORICAL RECORDS ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes

–

June 25, 1999

–

The State Historical Records Advisory Board met on June 25, 1999 at 10 a.m. in the Board Room at the Kentucky Department for Libraries and Archives (KDLA). Present were: Richard Belding, Coordinator; Barbara Teague, Deputy Coordinator; Mary Jane Kinsman, Louisville; Sharon Marcum, Governmental Services Center (GSC) Consultant; and Connie Renfroe, Public Records Division Secretary.

Mr. Belding welcomed Board members. Mr. Belding stated that KDLA staff had not made the progress it had hoped to in pulling together material for the Board's planning survey and that staff is still in that process. The hope is to be able to circulate a draft among members by e-mail.

Ms. Teague facilitated the grant review portion of the meeting. The Board reviewed the University of Kentucky's (UK) Electronic Records grant project. Mr. Belding introduced Charles Robb, Manager of the Technology and Analysis Support Branch, Public Records Division, KDLA and said he had asked Mr. Robb to give the Board the benefit of his technical expertise and familiarity with other kinds of initiatives in this area. Mr. Robb provided an overview of NHPRC-based projects relating to management of electronic records and talked about three other grant proposals that were referenced to in the UK grant proposal: the Pittsburgh Functional Requirements Project, the Indiana University Electronic Records grant and the New York Center for Technology and Government's Models for Action grant.

Mr. Robb stated that NHPRC has developed a research agenda for work in electronic recordkeeping. The Pittsburgh Functional Requirements project was the first major initiative funded under the agenda guidelines; it was implemented from 1993-1996. It was designed to identify functional requirements for electronic recordkeeping and to do some testing of them. One of the perceived shortcomings of the Pittsburgh project was a lack of real world grounding. A follow-on project, the Indiana University project, was proposed to test

assumptions of the Pittsburgh project and to make it more real world. It looked at specific systems and tested Pittsburgh's metadata guidelines. The Indiana Project focus was the university setting, making it relevant to the UK proposal.

The Center of Technology in Government's Models for Action project is a better example of a records management-based proposal. It was more technical in its use of programming methodologies and more real world in the sense that it involved an operational system's development. It encompassed a system containing lots of critical records which have known research and long-term retention values. Recordkeeping was an up front requirement. That was the difference between what Indiana University did and what New York did. Mr. Robb suggested, according to his review of the University of Kentucky grant, that UK elaborate on what would be accomplished from this project. He mentioned that several teams are listed as participating, but the application did not very specifically mention what these teams would be doing.

Discussion was held. The Board agreed that the proposal should be funded, but that a revision be made to have more external advisors from the archival electronic records community and the medical informatics professions. This would offer an important perspective in the design and implementation. This grant would improve the medical center's recordkeeping and help involve the university archives in the medical center. This grant could serve as a model for other medical centers in research evolution and development. This is a sizable program development opportunity. The research potential of records should be more amplified.

A lunch break was taken from 12:15 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.

Following lunch, Mr. Belding stated that the Department had submitted a capital construction and capital equipment request to the Capital Planning Advisory Board in April. Shortly thereafter, the Cabinet had counseled the Department to revise that document. The original plan asked for the same kind of addition to this building requested in 1997. This would bring all of KDLA's off-site operations to KDLA's main site and provide for expansion of its on-site operations all at that one site. KDLA has two large leased facilities in Frankfort . Under the old plan, all of that material would have been brought on-site to Coffee Tree Road and the department would have expanded its archival storage capacity, its archival public service area, its micrographics and imaging capacity, and its training facilities capacity in this new addition, to be better able to have public agencies do for themselves what they need to be doing for themselves. The amended version provides for all of the above features minus the integration of leased facilities.

The perspective was that there was not a high enough level of interest in building a new facility extending the State Records Center mission into the next century. The Cabinet was comfortable with the policy of continuing to lease a State Records Center facility for as long as it might be necessary. The new plan features a central digital archives, and the new building

addition is called the Kentucky Commonwealth Data Archives. The building addition is archivally focused, in the sense that it is designed to meet the Department's archival management needs for state and local agencies. KDLA has a particular focus on the creation of a physical facility for the digital archives but at the same time

it recognizes public agencies are in a state of transition, and there will continue to need to meet the archival storage requirements of public agencies in other ways. Some of those will be by accession of paper records. The second large component of this proposal is a very substantial expansion of the department's capacity to digitize records. Essentially the would be doing retrospective conversion of these records to electronic form to:

1. better manage the growth of paper holdings;
2. offer the potential for wider accessibility to these materials electronically across the Internet or through integration of existing agency resources; and
3. by pairing that digitization with a parallel micrographics program, ensuring the preservation of this material while digitization provides for its wider accessibility

The department's capital equipment request is ranked about 12th of about 14 that were identified as "high value" by the Office of the Chief Information Office (CIO). It is important that KDLA continue to make clear that its mission is distinct from a lot of the information technology initiatives, but that it has a number of mutual interests with those initiatives.

Discussion was held on the strategic planning timeline. Ms. Marcum suggested that the Board review the draft mission, vision, and values statement and send the revised draft to Board members that were not present at today's meeting. It was recommended that they be given a deadline of when to submit changes or comments. Once all the responses are in, then this document could be considered the final version. Ms. Teague stated that the draft survey instrument for government agencies had not been distributed.

Discussion was held on the possibility of holding the Board meetings at other locations, thus sharing the transportation burden with other Board members and also giving Board members an opportunity to visit other sites. Board members could take turns hosting these meetings. Mr. Belding suggested have public hearings in conjunction with these Board meetings in order to get some feedback on the Board's strategic planning activity.

Ms. Marcum reviewed and discussed with the Board the strategic planning process on the following points:

Strategic Issues/Concerns

- Institutional stability of repositories
- Institutional support

- <u>Need for education and training for those with custodial responsibility</u>
- <u>Lack of public understanding of valued historical records and this need for support</u>
- <u>Electronic records – rapid rate of change in software and hardware; absence of archival consciousness of the value of historical records in electronic form</u>

- <u>Accessibility of records/inadequacy of repositories/failure to recognize options and opportunities</u>
- <u>Preservation strategies – fiscal/physical resources, management strategies</u>
- <u>Increased expectations due to computers creating a desire for instant gratification, instant access</u>
- <u>Lack of communication among stakeholders and affected constituencies</u>
- <u>Board members comfort in serving as go-between between an applicant and NHPRC being a knowledgeable resource</u>
- <u>Training for Board Members</u>
- <u>Information sessions for prospective applicants</u>
- <u>Outreach to historical records repositories to build applicants' awareness of grant application process</u>
- <u>Helping grant applicants to be competitive</u>
- <u>Identifying potential applicants for grants for smaller projects, which SHRAB might be able to find through regrant funds</u>
- <u>Sharing successes from other states</u>
- <u>Enhancing the Board's WEB page</u>

<u>Ms. Marcum stated that this list provided good stimulation for Board members to think about. They could then input their ideas and the final strategic plan could be completed.</u>

<u>There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:35 p.m.</u>